



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SG  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,704	07/20/2001	William A. Huffman	062986.0205	9987
7590	06/24/2005		EXAMINER	
Baker Botts L.L.P. Suite 600 2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75201-2980			LEE, CHRISTOPHER E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2112	

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/909,704	HUFFMAN, WILLIAM A.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Christopher E. Lee	2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Receipt Acknowledgement***

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the Amendment filed on 21<sup>st</sup> of March 2005. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended; no claim has been canceled; and no claim has been newly added since the RCE Non-Final Office Action was mailed on 23<sup>rd</sup> of December 2004. Currently, claims 1-15 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauman et al. [US 6,160,812 A; hereinafter Bauman] in view of Trull [US 6,185,672 B1].

*Referring to claim 1*, Bauman discloses a method of managing an arbitration queue (i.e., requests queues 252, 254, 256, 258, and primary arbitration queues 282, 284, 286, 288 in Fig. 17; See col. 3, lines 30-35) having a plurality of queue entries (i.e., requests; See col. 16, lines 37-44) comprising: introducing entries (i.e., requests) into said queue at a time-ordered queue location (See col. 16, lines 44-52); associating each entry after placement in said queue (i.e., said requests are placed (viz., enqueued) into said queue before being grouped into channel module's request buffer) to one of a plurality of groups (i.e., each entry being associated with one of channel modules, which has a group of requests for primary arbitration; See col. 8, lines 15-32), each of said plurality of groups (i.e., requests group per said channel module) having a different transaction parameter criteria (i.e., different packet priority schemes, e.g., based on the time, or a factor other than time; See col. 8, lines 15-44); determining which particular one of said plurality of groups to service (i.e., determining which channel module to be granted by IGRANT\_CHN in Fig. 7) based on said transaction parameter criteria (See col. 8, line 60 through col. 9, line 3); and servicing a particular entry in said particular one of said plurality of groups based on servicing

criteria (i.e., one of requests being granted by IGRANT\_CHN is operating based on said packet priority being set by LEVEL\_SEL in Fig. 7; See col. 10, lines 26-37).

Bauman does not expressly teach introducing said entries into said queue at a first, highest order queue location; determining if lower order queue locations are available; moving all higher order queue location contents to an adjacent lower order queue location per cycle until all lower order locations are filled if lower order instruction queue if queue locations are available; and moving all higher order queue entries, with respect to said particular entry being serviced, to an adjacent lower order location in said queue.

Trull discloses a method and apparatus for out-of-order instruction dispatch and queue compaction (See Abstract), wherein introducing entries (i.e., new instructions) into queue (i.e., instruction queue 314 in Figs. 8B-C) at a first, highest order queue location (i.e., “top” or start of the queue; See col. 4, lines 31-32); determining if lower order queue locations are available (See col. 26, lines 24-27); if lower order queue locations (i.e., lower order lines, where the three instructions are allocated a “line” of instruction storage locations, e.g., storage locations 200, 202, 204, 206, 208, 210 in Fig. 8A; See col. 14, lines 22-24) are available, moving all higher order queue location (i.e., all higher order lines in Figs. 8A-C) contents to an adjacent lower order queue location (i.e., adjacent lower order line of instruction storage locations 200, 202 and 204 in Figs. 8A-C) per cycle (i.e., per compression cycle; See col. 20, lines 19-38) until all lower order locations are filled (See col. 4, lines 33-42); servicing a particular entry (i.e., an instruction to be dispatched to processor pipe) in said queue based on servicing criteria (See col. 14, lines 36-51); and moving all higher order queue entries, with respect to said particular entry being serviced, to an adjacent lower order location (i.e., lower order line) in said queue (See col. 18, line 61 through col. 19, line 24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included said method of queuing operation with said queue compaction, as disclosed by Trull, in said method of managing said arbitration queue, as disclosed by Bauman, for the advantage of for the advantage of providing said arbitration queue configured to service transactions (i.e., dispatch

instructions) in an out-of-order fashion (i.e., an entry can be removed from any location in the queue) and perform collapse of queue entries (i.e., compaction of strings) of empty storage locations (See Trull, col. 3, lines 48-62 and col. 4, lines 20-23).

*Referring to claim 2*, Trull teaches the step of marking a location of a serviced entry (i.e., marking ‘clear bit’ as setting empty bit; See col. 18, lines 10-13) as idle (i.e., empty; See block 262A of Fig. 11B and col. 21, lines 63-67).

*Referring to claim 3*, Trull teaches said moving step further comprising for higher order locations with respect to said idle location (i.e., empty storage location), writing the contents of higher order queue locations into adjacent lower order queue locations (i.e., shift one row down; See Block 262D of Fig. 11B and col. 22, lines 19-26); and for lower order locations with respect to said idle location, rewriting the current entry into said location (i.e., no shift operation; See Block 262C of Fig. 11B and col. 22, lines 26-30; Note - the embodiment of Fig. 8A has a null logic as the new value logic in Fig. 9D).

*Referring to claim 5*, Trull teaches providing a plurality of registers (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 206, 212, 218, 224, 230 and 236 in Fig. 8B-C) corresponding to a number of entries in said queue (i.e., a number of instructions in said instruction queue 314 in Figs. 8B-C; See col. 5, lines 7-10), said plurality of registers being arranged in a linear array (i.e., instruction storage locations of each column being arranged in a linear array in Figs. 8B-C) from a highest order register (i.e., a highest order storage location, e.g., storage location 236 in Figs. 8B-C) to a lower order register (i.e., a lower order storage location, e.g., storage location 200 in Figs. 8B-C); for each register (i.e., for each instruction storage location), selectively providing to each register an entry from that register or an entry from a higher order register (See Fig. 8A and col. 18, line 63 through col. 19, line 2).

*Referring to claim 6*, Trull teaches said plurality of registers (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 206, 212, 218, 224, 230 and 236 in Fig. 8B-C) includes entries (i.e., new instructions) are added to said queue via said highest order register (See Figs. 3A, 3B, 11A and col. 21, lines 54-61).

*Referring to claim 7,* Trull teaches said plurality of registers (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 206, 212, 218, 224, 230 and 236 in Fig. 8B-C) each have an entry output such that an entry can be removed from any location in said queue (See col. 21, lines 37-41).

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauman [US 6,160,812 A] in view of Trull [US 6,185,672 B1] as applied to claims 1-3 and 5-7 above, and further in view of what was well known in the art, as exemplified by Garcia et al. [US 6,145,061 A; hereinafter Garcia].

*Referring to claim 4,* Bauman, as modified by Trull, discloses all the limitations of the claim 4 except that does not teach the step of initializing all queue locations to an idle state prior to the step of introducing entries into said queue.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that initializing all queue locations to an idle state prior to introducing entries into said queue, is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art, as evidenced by Garcia (i.e., initializing by zeroing all the entries prior to moving data from the old queue into a new queue; See Garcia, col. 2, line 54 through col. 3, line 13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have been initializing all queue locations (i.e., instruction storage locations) to an idle state (i.e., empty) prior to introducing entries into said queue (i.e., inputting instructions into instruction queue) since it would have obviate any potential malfunction by garbage data (i.e., floating data in the queue after the queue creation and/or power-on operation) in the queue.

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauman [US 6,160,812 A] in view of Trull [US 6,185,672 B1] as applied to claims 1-3 and 5-7 above, and further in view of Case Law, In re Yount, 36 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 775, 171 F2.2d 317, 80 USPQ 141.

*Referring to claim 8,* Bauman, as modified by Trull, discloses all the limitations of the claim 8 including said plurality of registers (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 206, 212, 218, 224, 230 and

236 in Fig. 8B-C; Trull) having 21 registers (i.e., 7 instruction storage locations; Trull) except that does not expressly teach said plurality of registers having 64 registers.

However, the claim recites said 64 registers without any patentable advantage in the specification (See claim 8 and Application page 12, lines 1-4), such as the reason of “said plurality of registers including 64 registers instead of 7 registers, 21 registers, 32 registers or 128 registers” with any patentable advantage. Therefore, the limitation of “said plurality of registers including 64 registers” in the claim is not patentably significant since it at most relates to the flexible number of registers under consideration which is not ordinarily a matter of invention. *In re Yount, 36 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 775, 171 F2.2d 317, 80 USPQ 141.*

6. Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyers et al. [US 5,375,223 A; cited by the Applicant; hereinafter Meyers] in view of Bauman [US 6,160,812 A] and Trull [US 6,185,672 B1].

*Referring to claim 9,* Meyers discloses a computer system (i.e., multiprocessor data processing system in Fig. 1) comprising: a distributed shared memory system (i.e., main memory 300 of Fig. 1); a plurality of processors (i.e., Processors 100 in Fig. 1) generating transactions to said distributed shared memory system (See col. 3, lines 41-48); and a memory interface (i.e., memory access circuit 200 of Fig. 1) interposed between said distributed shared memory system and said plurality of processors (See Fig. 1; i.e., Memory Access circuit 200 interposed between Processors 100 and Main Memory 300 in Fig. 1), said memory interface having cache memory (i.e., Cache (L2) 220 of Fig. 1); an arbitration queue (i.e., Q 215 of Fig. 1) having a plurality of entry locations (i.e., n multi-bits positions in register 250 in Fig. 8), and a memory arbitration processor (i.e., control logic 212 of Fig. 1) for servicing transactions from said plurality of processors (See col. 4, line 61 through col. 5, line 38), said memory arbitration processor performing a memory arbitration scheme (See Fig. 2, col. 4, lines 55-60 and col. 7, line 29 through col. 8, line 32).

Meyer does not teach placing transactions as entries in said arbitration queue; associating entries after placement in said arbitration queue to one of a plurality of groups, each of said plurality of groups having a different transaction parameter criteria; determining which particular one of said plurality of groups to service based on said transaction parameter criteria; and servicing a particular entry in said particular one of said plurality of groups.

Bauman discloses an apparatus for supplying requests to a scheduler (See Abstract and Fig. 17), wherein means for managing an arbitration queue (i.e., requests queues 252, 254, 256, 258, and primary arbitration queues 282, 284, 286, 288 in Fig. 17) comprising placing transactions as entries (i.e., requests) in said arbitration queue (See col. 16, lines 44-52); associating entries after placement in said arbitration queue (i.e., said requests are placed (viz., enqueued) into said arbitration queue before being grouped into channel module's request buffer) to one of a plurality of groups (i.e., each entry being associated with one of channel modules, which has a group of requests for primary arbitration; See col. 8, lines 15-32), each of said plurality of groups (i.e., requests group per said channel module) having a different transaction parameter criteria (i.e., different packet priority schemes, e.g., based on the time, or a factor other than time; See col. 8, lines 15-44); determining which particular one of said plurality of groups to service (i.e., determining which channel module to be granted by IGRANT\_CHN in Fig. 7) based on said transaction parameter criteria (See col. 8, line 60 through col. 9, line 3); and servicing a particular entry in said particular one of said plurality of groups (i.e., one of requests being granted by IGRANT\_CHN is operating based on said packet priority being set by LEVEL\_SEL in Fig. 7; See col. 10, lines 26-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included said means for managing said arbitration queue, as disclosed by Bauman, in said memory arbitration scheme, as disclosed by Meyer, for the advantage of said memory arbitration scheme (i.e., arbitration method) being that said memory arbitration processor (i.e., primary scheduler) is presented with a more diverse said arbitration queue (i.e., primary arbitration queue) from which to select

transactions (i.e., packets) for transfer through said memory interface (i.e., switch; See Bauman, col. lines 5-8).

Meyer, as modified by Bauman, does not teach said arbitration queue is collapsible and said memory arbitration scheme further comprising: marking a location of said particular entry in said arbitration queue as idle; and collapsing said arbitration queue by bringing all higher order entries into adjacent lower order locations in said queue to fill said idle location.

Trull discloses an apparatus for instruction queue compression (See Abstract and col. 1, lines 6-8), wherein an arbitration queue (i.e., instruction queue 160 of Fig. 3A) is collapsible (i.e., compaction process; See col. 4, lines 39-42) and a memory arbitration scheme (i.e., managing an instruction queue; See col. 5, lines 4-21) comprising: servicing at least one entry in said arbitration queue (i.e., an instruction to be dispatched to processor pipe; See col. 14, lines 36-51); marking a location of said particular entry in said arbitration queue (i.e., marking ‘clear bit’ as setting empty bit; See col. 18, lines 10-13) as idle (i.e., empty; See block 262A of Fig. 11B and col. 21, lines 63-67); and collapsing said arbitration queue (i.e., compaction process) by bringing all higher order entries (i.e., all higher order instructions in Figs. 8A-C) into adjacent lower order locations (i.e., adjacent lower order lines of instruction storage locations composed of 3 columns in Figs. 8A-C) in said queue to fill an idle location (i.e., shifting down to adjacent lower order line and filling empty location; See col. 18, line 61 through col. 19, line 24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have substituted said collapsible arbitration queue and said memory arbitration scheme, as disclosed by Trull, for said arbitration queue and memory arbitration scheme, as disclosed by Meyer, as modified by Bauman, for the advantage of providing said arbitration queue configured to service transactions (i.e., dispatch instructions) in an out-of-order fashion (i.e., an entry can be removed from any location in the queue) and perform collapse of queue entries (i.e., compaction of strings) of said idle locations (i.e., empty storage locations; See Trull, col. 3, lines 48-62 and col. 4, lines 20-23).

*Referring to claim 10,* Trull teaches said collapsing operation comprises: for higher order queue locations with respect to said idle location (i.e., empty storage location), writing the contents of higher order queue locations into adjacent lower order queue locations (i.e., shift one row down; See Block 262D of Fig. 11B and col. 22, lines 19-26); and for lower order queue locations with respect to said idle location, rewriting the current entry into said location (i.e., no shift operation; See Block 262C of Fig. 11B and col. 22, lines 26-30; Note - the embodiment of Fig. 8A has a null logic as the new value logic in Fig. 9D).

*Referring to claim 11,* Trull teaches said plurality of entry locations (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 202, 204, ... 236, 238, 240 in Fig. 8B) includes a highest order location (i.e., instruction storage locations 236, 238, 240 in Fig. 8B) and a lowest order location (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 202, 204 in Fig. 8B), and wherein entries (i.e., new instructions) are added to said queue via said highest order location (See Figs. 3A, 3B, 11A and col. 21, lines 54-61).

*Referring to claim 12,* Trull teaches said arbitration queue (i.e., instruction queue 160 of Fig. 3A) comprising a plurality of registers (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 202, 204, 206, 208, 210 in Fig. 8A) corresponding to the number of entries in said queue (See col. 5, lines 7-10); a plurality of 2:1 multiplexers (i.e., multiplexers 250, 252, 254, 256, 258, 260 in Fig. 8A) interposed between said registers (See Fig. 8A) such that one multiplexer is interposed between a higher order register and a subsequent register (e.g., a multiplexer 250 is interposed between a higher instruction storage location 206 and a subsequent instruction storage location 200 in Fig. 8A), the output of said higher order register (e.g., output from instruction storage location 206 in Fig. 8A) being coupled to a first input of said one multiplexer (i.e., an input of multiplexer 250 in Fig. 8A), the output of said subsequent register (i.e., output from instruction storage location 200 in Fig. 8A) being coupled to a second input of said one multiplexer (i.e., another input of multiplexer 250 in Fig. 8A), an output of said one multiplexer being coupled to said subsequent register (i.e., an output of multiplexer 250 is coupled to instruction storage

location 200 in Fig. 8A), and a mux control line (i.e., SHIFT\_ROW\_1 in Fig. 8A) being coupled to said one multiplexer to direct the contents of one of said first and second multiplexer inputs to said multiplexer output (See col. 18, line 63 through col. 19, line 2).

However, the recitation in the claim “whereby the mux control line associated with the higher order register and subsequent register determines whether the subsequent register is refreshed with its current contents or receives the contents of the higher order register” has not been given patentable weight because it has been held that the functional “whereby” statement does not define any structure and accordingly cannot serve to distinguish. *In re Mason*, 114 USPQ 127, 44 CCPA 937 (1957).

*Referring to claim 13*, Trull teaches said plurality of registers (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 202, 204, ... 236, 238, 240 in Fig. 8B) includes a highest order register (i.e., instruction storage locations 236, 238, 240 in Fig. 8B) and a lowest order register (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 202, 204 in Fig. 8B), and wherein entries (i.e., new instructions) are added to said queue via said highest order register (See Figs. 3A, 3B, 11A and col. 21, lines 54-61).

*Referring to claim 14*, Trull teaches said plurality of registers (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 202, 204, ... 236, 238, 240 in Fig. 8B) each have an entry output such that an entry can be removed from any location in said queue (See col. 21, lines 37-41).

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyers [US 5,375,223 A] in view of Bauman [US 6,160,812 A] and Trull [US 6,185,672 B1] as applied to claims 9-14 above, and further in view of Case Law, *In re Yount*, 36 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 775, 171 F2.2d 317, 80 USPQ 141.

*Referring to claim 15*, Meyers, as modified by Bauman and Trull, discloses all the limitations of the claim 15 including said plurality of registers (i.e., instruction storage locations 200, 202, 204, ... 236, 238, 240 in Fig. 8B; Trull) having 21 registers (i.e., 21 instruction storage locations; Trull), except that does not expressly teach said plurality of registers having 64 registers.

However, the claim recites said 64 registers without any patentable advantage in the specification (See claim 15 and Application page 12, lines 1-4), such as the reason of “said plurality of registers including 64 registers instead of 21 registers, 32 registers or 128 registers” with any patentable advantage. Therefore, the limitation of “said plurality of registers including 64 registers” in the claim is not patentably significant since it at most relates to the flexible number of registers under consideration which is not ordinarily a matter of invention. *In re Yount*, 36 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 775, 171 F2.2d 317, 80 USPQ 141.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*In response to the Applicant's argument with respect to “... associating each entry (entries) after placement in the arbitration queue to one of a plurality of groups, ...” in the exemplary claims 1 and 9, the Examiner brought Bauman [US 6,160,812 A] reference in the rejection for the limitations which are not provided by Trull [US 6,185,672 B1] and all of the other art cited.*

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Velasco et al. [US 6,442,568 B1] disclose customer information control system application programming interface with transient data functions, in a loosely coupled data processing environment.

Lerman et al. [US 6,378,036 B2] disclose queuing architecture including a plurality of queues and associated method for scheduling disk access requests for video content.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher E. Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-3637. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30am - 2:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark H. Rinehart can be reached on 571-272-3632. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher E. Lee  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2112

CEL/*CEL*

*Glenn A. Auve*  
Glenn A. Auve  
Primary Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100